DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 569 EC 182 090

AUTHOR Anderson, Dana McCoy; Ritter, Shirley A.
TITLE Training District Personnel as Peer Consultants and Inservice Leaders: Implementation and Evaluation of a Training Program.
INSTITUTION Furman Univ., Greenville, S.C.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE [85]
GRANT G008200423
NOTE 34p.; Project SITE, School Initiated Teacher Education.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Consultation Programs; *Disabilities; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Educator Education; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

For the past three years, Furman University has offered training for special educators to develop skills as peer inservice providers and as peer consultants to general education personnel. By means of a personnel preparation grant, School Initiated Teacher Education (SITE) Outreach has involved 61 special education teachers, speech therapists, and curriculum specialists in a series of three graduate level courses designed to address development of skills in inservice content and presentation and peer consultation. Evaluation data were collected to determine the impact of the training program, perceived benefits to the participants, and the receptiveness of the participating school districts in terms of the incorporation of peer inservice and consultation activities into the ongoing instructional program. Findings revealed an increased stress on consultation in job descriptions and a clear preference for individual, informal meetings to conduct consultation activities for most teachers. (Author/CL)

Training District Personnel as Peer Consultants and Inservice Leaders: Implementation and Evaluation of a Training Program

Dana McCoy Anderson

Shirley A. Ritter

Furman University

Both authors are Assistant Professors in the Department of Education, Furman University, Greenville, SC 29613.

This paper was supported in part by Grant G008200423 from the U. S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, to Project SITE, School Initiated Teacher Education, Furman University.

Running Head: TRAINING PEERS

Abstract

For the past three years, Furman University has offered training for special educators to develop skills as peer inservice providers and as peer consultants to general education personnel. By means of a personnel preparation grant, School Initiated Teacher Education (SITE) Outreach has involved 61 special education teachers, speech therapists, and curriculum specialists in a series of three graduate level courses designed to address development of skills in inservice content and presentation and peer consultation. Evaluation data were collected to determine the impact of the training program, perceived benefits to the participants, and the receptiveness of the participating school districts in terms of the incorporation of peer inservice and consultation activities into the ongoing instructional program.

Training District Personnel as Peer Consultants and Inservice Leaders

The search for effective school components has been a focal point of research for the past decade. Every major research study on effective schools has noted the phenomenon of group action, a agreed-on purpose and a belief in the attainment of educational objectives as reliable indicators of effective schools (Pratzner, 1984). Glickman (1985) states that "effective schools do not happen by accident: Supervision is the force that shapes the organization into a productive unit." With the target of instructional improvement, Glickman proposes that supervisors should use a variety of practices that gradually increase choice and control over instructional improvement, the result being that teachers will become more committed to improvement and able to contribute collectively to group efforts at improvement.

Essentially, two avenues are available to teachers seeking direct human assistance in the improvement of their instruction. This element of direct assistance is crucial to the development of effective schools (Edmonds, 1982) and to teacher satisfaction when couched in terms of quantitative feedback (Dornbush & Scott, 1975; Natriello, 1982). Lortie (1975, pp. 75-77) found that teachers desiring instructional feedback initially sought out fellow teachers for this purpose and secondarily utilized supervisory or administrative personnel. One avenue is the supervisory direct assistance via the clinical supervision

model. This five step procedure developed by Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer (1969) consists of the following: preconference with teacher; observation of classroom; analysis amd interpretation of observation; postconference with teacher; and critique of previous steps. This cycle is well accepted and standardized and is used widely by supervisory and administrative personnel (Sullivan, 1980; Reavis, 1977). Recent research by Glickman (1985) has pointed towards the modification of the traditional cycle utilizing directive, collaborative, and nondirective approaches by which to meet the developmental instructional needs of the teacher.

Of recent interest in the field of instructional supervision has been the phenomenon known variously as peer supervision or collegial supervision. This practice, which has been hotly debated in higher education circles for the past five years, is primarily the adoption of the clinical supervision model developed at Harvard (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, 1969). McFaul and Cooper (1984) elaborate on the extensive discussion of this supervisory strategy while pointing out that forms of clinical supervision used in peer situations are actually mutations of the original concept. In the book Differentiated Supervision, Glatthorn (1984) notes the term "peer supervision" has negative connotations for teachers; and suggests will be placed in an evaluative capacity over other teachers. A broader term, "cooperative professional development" or "peer support", is suggested as inclusive of other traditional supervisory strategies available for instructional improvement. Four

components are suggested which differentiate the activities of cooperative professional development from those of the role of formal supervisor within the organization. These include a moderately, rather than highly, formalized professional relationship; reciprocal rather than unilateral observations and followup conferences; employee only, as opposed to administrative involvement; and exclusion of evaluative activities in relation to salary, retention, and promotion.. Although this reflects yet a broader definition of cooperative peer instructional behavior, it is nonetheless a close relative of the original clinical supervision model because it retain the basic cycle steps of preobservation conference, observation, and postobservation conference.

Glickman (1985) identifies three dimensions of formal supervisory activity: a) interpersonal skills,b) technical skills in observation and research, and c) mastery of the tasks of supervision such as group development, direct assistance to teachers, action research, curriculum development, and inservice education. There have been some tentative investigations into the utilization of several of these skills by teachers themselves to improve classroom instruction. Training teachers for focused observations was suggested by Kerman (1979). Lawrence and Branch (1978) proposed the use of a panel of teachers to coordinate and direct inservice activities within a district. Certainly the clinical supervision component is only one of many models available to teachers desiring to work in a collegial manner for professional development.

The current status of peer supervision can be interpreted only in the context of the success and appropriateness of peer use of the clinical supervision model. Specific criticisms include the lack of technical and content skills on the part of teachers, the use of the clinical cycle without reference to organizational goals, and the lack of support within the traditional school bureaucracy to reassign traditional supervisory activities.

A model which meets most of these criticisms is Project RETOOL, developed by the Council for Exceptional Children and disseminated through a training manual (Idol-Maestas, Nevin, & Paolucci-Whitcomb, 1984). This project builds on empirical, legislative, and philosophical mandates to assert that exceptional students should be educated in the least restrictive educational environment. For the majority of handicapped students with a mild of disability, the setting would be the regular classroom. Project RETOOL uses a "trainer of trainers" model to disseminate a triadic model of consultation using the three components of consultant, teacher and student to facilitate the delivery of effective services. This requires both the consultant (special education teacher) and a mediator (regular classroom teacher) to develop jointly effective programs for specific students in the mainstream setting. The assumption is that, by means of collaborative collegial interaction, capitalizing on the assets of both the consultant and the mediator, the organizational goal of successful programatic maintenance of exceptional students in the

mainstream can be attained.

The triadic model trains teachers to use four principles of collaboration in a modified clinical supervision cycle. Specifically the model requires team ownership of the referred student's problems; implementing changes through recognition for individual difference in developmental progress through stages; c) the application of reinforcement principles and practices results in improved skills, knowledge, and attitudes for all members of the team implementing the triadic model of consultation; and d) the utilization ofdata-based decisions through a functional analysis of behavior. Training in consultation skills also includes six generic principles of consultation: a) principles from situational leadership guide the implementation; b) cooperative goal structures underlie conflict resolution; c) use of appropriate interview skills; d) principles of active listening; e) communication in non-jargon language; and f) positive non-verbal language is required for implementation.

The triadic model of consultation includes interaction between two persons who share responsibility for changing another person's behavior. Part of that responsibility includes establishing goals and objectives and developing educational solutions and evaluation of progress toward them. Consultants who use the model must be leaders, trainers, listeners, and learners incorporating simultaneously the skills of situational leadership, information sharing, confrontation, and feedback. A central feature of this model and others is the identification

of the consultant as the person with specialized content skills who must transfer this information in the context of a collaborative relationship.

A third approach to provide teacher instructional improvement toward the goal of effective schools is the inservice training model. Also a well established model, inservice has been the focal point of much research to determine the components of effective use of this model. Amongst the vast inservice literature, two research studies reveal several critical factors. Berman and McLaughlin (1978) in a study conducted by the Rand Corporation found that successful inservice project included training that was concrete, continual, and directly relevant to the teacher; that local resource personnel provided direct followup assistance to teachers after inservice activities and that inseravice was planned with teachers prior to implementation. Effective factors detailed by Lawrence (1974) included the use of individualized inservice programs and the use of teachers are active planners and collaborators.

All three staff development models have support for improving instruction in the schools. The trend from the literature seems to point toward an increasing use of teachers as resources for instructional improvement for their colleagues through both the inservice and the cooperative professional development model. In preparing regular educators to meet the needs of exceptional students, both models were viewed as effective in the dissemination of instructional content to

extended audiences in school districts distant from university campuses.

An adaptation of the model proposed by Project RETOOL was implemented in a training program entitled School-Initiated Teacher Education (SITE)-Outreach sponsored by Furman University (Greenville, SC) between 1982 and 1985. The most notable adaptations included the use of peer developed and presented inservice programs as the primary vehicle by which to deliver content information to regular education classroom teachers. The use of collaborative consultation supplemented the inservice presentations with the addition of one-to-one contact to solve specific problems in the integration of handicapped students into the regular classroom. A common criticism of peer supervision activities frequently cited is the lack of technical skill on the part of the consultant classroom teacher. A unique feature of this training program was the development of a three course sequence of university classes designed to provide the participants with skills in special education content, inservice presentation, and collaborative consultation. Finally, the current Project RETOOL model was developed from teacher training programs geared to prepare people for roles as full time special education consultants. The current project attempted to train teachers whose primary responsibilities remained in the classroom but who could also incorporate the professional growth activities of inservice provision and collaborative consultation within current job descriptions.

The current SITE-Outreach Program was founded upon the

success of an earlier three year grant, Project SITE, a cooperative, field-based regular education inservice program operated by Furman University within the School District of Greenville County, SC. The initial project utilized Furman University faculty to provide inservice to over 300 teachers and principals regarding the accommodation of handicapped students in the regular classroom. Evaluative data on the project indicated that teachers improved dramatically not only in knowledge and competence but also in teaching behavior.(Grant report #G007901243*). Teachers receiving instruction through Project SITE perceived themselves as competent as trained special educators in meeting the needs of handicapped students. Based upon post-project evaluation data, Project SITE staff gradually developed an inservice program which appeared to be quite effective in meeting the needs of handicapped students.

As information concerning the project was disseminated, school districts in the region and state requested assistance far beyond the fiscal and geographic resources of the original model. As a result, a new concept was added to the original field-based delivery model in use and presented to service providers for approval. In Project SITE, the project coordinator taught the classes in the program directly to the teachers. That traditional approach is inordinately time consuming. Recognizing that university personnel alone would be unable to meet the need, a two-fold project purpose was developed. First, project faculty were utilized with select teams of special education teachers and supervisory personnel

from the outlying school districts in the northwest region of South Carolina. Team members were provided Project SITE training plus instruction on methods and techniques for conducting inservice and offering in-the-class followup for regular educators. Furman faculty provided direct assistance for participants to conduct district-wide needs assessment, determine inservice objectives, plan workshop content and sequence, secure material, and evaluate the workshop and participant learning. Participants then returned to their respective school districts and established inservice programs designed to meet local needs. A second purpose was to assist groups of trainees (Inservice Trainers Provision Teams (ITPs)) with technical assistance, consultation, and materials for implementing the inservice content. The 'train the trainers' approach has a multiplier effect which can serve as a model for small universities and colleges working jointly with local education agencies to provide high quality field-based inservice.

Program Overview

The programmatic objectives for the SITE-Outreach Program participants included both knowledge and performance competencies. Included in this instruction were the characteristics of exceptional students, the appropriate use of assessment techniques, design of curriculum, selection of appropriate methods and materials, classroom management procedures, consultation skills, and workshop presentation skills.

The competencies were achieved by means of a three course sequence, each course carrying graduate university credit. The first course, (three semester hours of credit) was entitled "Teaching the Handicapped Student in the Regular Classroom." The workshops which comprised the course were directed toward preparing trainees as inservice education teachers in the integration of handicapped students into the least restrictive environment. The training content consisted of background information on of handicapping conditions, identification, assessment, and evaluation of individuals, due process procedures and referral for evaluation, and special methods and materials for instructional and behavioral management in the classroom. Consultation techniques were included in later course offerings.

The second course of the sequence, (also for three semester hours credit) was "Adapting Methods and Materials for Teaching the Handicapped in the Regular Class". While essentially a continuation of the first course, this segment emphasized practical methods and materials. The IPTs focused on alternative organizational planning for the general education class, effective instructional strategies for teaching reading and math, reading in the content area, and adapting science and social studies for the learner with special needs.

The third and final course for the IPTs was "Seminar in Workshop Preparation and College Teaching", (two semester hour graduate course). This seminar provided participants with specific instruction needed for planning and conducting

workshops and teaching college classes. The use of needs assessments, audio-visual equipment, techniques for lecturing, development of simulation activities, evaluation techniques, and resource utilization comprised the course content. Logistic and organizational problems of inservice education and current trends and issues in inservice education were also discussed. Consultation skills were included in this course for groups not receiving that content in the first course of the sequence.

When each group of participants had completed the classroom training component, they returned to their districts to fulfill the second component of the training program. They were expected to become members of the district's regular education inservice provision team (IPT). As IPT members they would a) conduct awareness activities to inform teachers of the needs; and b) conduct workshops for inservice points after school and on inservice days focusing on the characteristics of handicapped students, assessment strategies, instructional and curricular methods, and consulting with special education and regular education teachers. Each participant was expected to conduct the inservice program or workshop planned as a course assignment during the final course of the sequence. A resource laboratory at Furman was made available for Outreach use. These resources included books, videotapes, movies, filmstrips, instructional materials, and assessment tools. The content of the prearranged inservice programs could be for graduate credit or for inservice points toward recertification. Approved topics were directed toward presenting a rationale for

integrating handicapped students into the general education class, the characteristics of children to be mainstreamed, the general education instructional modifications needed, behavior management techniques, and the types of resources available. Project staff were available to monitor the content and quality of the inservice program, offer technical assistance, and serve as a resource for consultation and evaluation.

Method

Several types of evaluation were developed to measure the effectiveness of the Project in terms of participant acquisition of performance competencies. The project coordinator made periodic on-site visits to participant schools to observe the implementation of effective mainstreaming strategies. Summative evaluation took the form of a social validation, focusing on participant and administrators' satisfaction with the program, with some attention to post-program implementaiton of inservice. Consumer satisfaction in terms of recipient teachers' satisfaction was not available at the close of the study.

Evaluation information was obtained through questionnaires sent to all 51 participants who had completed the three course sequence within the past two years. A ten dollar incentive check was promised to participants completing the questionnaire. In addition an administrators' questionnaire was sent to each participant's principal, superintendent, and curriculum director (if such a position existed within the district). Of 51 surveys sent to participants, 42 (82%) were returned. Of 64 questionnaires mailed to administrators 48 (75%) were returned

without prearranged incentives.

Questionnaires

The participants' questionnaire was organized into six sections in order to obtain data on several training components. The initial section collected demographic information on the respondents. The remaining sections asked participants to rank factors and reply to open-ended questions regarding reasons for participation, extent of inservice delivery, relevance of training content, use of consulting skills, and support by grant personnel.

The questionnaire sent to district administrators used a fixed choice format to probe the level of awareness about the training program, perception of participants as instructional leaders, and the identification of factors that contributed to the adoption or preclusion of inservice and consulting activities by the participants within the district.

Results

A preliminary examination of the teacher participant questionnaire was made by the use of descriptive statistics and are presented in Tables 1 - 3. A demographic analysis revealed that with only one exception, respondents were entirely female. Most of the teachers were certified in more than one area of special education (69% in both mental retardation and learning disabilities) and 50% also held elementary education certificates. More than a third (35%) were employed teaching in a cross-categorical special education program. More than half the participants (73.8%) were employed in some capacity as a

special education resource teacher, the remainder representing closely allied service fields. No participant was required to attend the training; the primary reasons were recertification (19&), desire to improve teaching (14.3%) and acquisition of inservice skills (14.3%).

Table 1 indicates the participants' evaluation of the inservice delivery component required by the training sequence. Less than half of the teachers (45.2%) had completed the required inservice project in district implementation. Of those who were successful, seventeen of nineteen people cited district cooperation in planning and fourteen of nineteen reported district cooperation in delivery as factors supporting their efforts. The size of the audience for the inservice programs varied from less than 10 (2.4%) to approximately 100 (9.5%), with the distribution spread almost equally between the extremes.

Thirteen of nineteen (68%) peer inservice providers conducted the desired evaluation activity but only 31% (6 of 19) forwarded these evaluations on to the SITE coordinator. For those who did conduct the inservice project, fifteen of nineteen (79%) received performance feedback from district supervisory and administrative personnel; all of the reported feedback (85%) was either positive or extremely encouraging.

Insert Table 1 about here

The twenty-three participants who failed to implement the

project were asked to cite reasons for their difficulty. Almost half (47.8%) cited lack of district cooperation as the primary factor. The seventeen participants who responded to this item all cited additional factors as well which impeded implementation (lack of time, preparation, etc.)

The questionnaire also asked participants to evaluate the consultation component of the training. All participants reported spending some percentage of the workday engaged in consulting activities, most typically 0-2% (23.8%), 8-10% (19%), and 5-6% (16.7%). Thirty five percent of the 42 respondents indicated the consultant role had been incorporated into their job roles following completion of the SITE training; another thirty-three percent reported an increase of previous consulting time. One item that provided extremely revealing responses was one that asked if participants actively preferred consulting to inservice activities as a mode of dissemination. A sizeable majority (64.3%) responded yes to this item. Another fifty-two percent reported they had resorted to the exclusive use of consultation skills as a replacement for inservice delivery; twenty-three percent claimed use of consultation in addition to inservice delivery. A majority of participants (81%) indicated the use of individual meetings rather than group communications in the faculty lounge (38%) for consultation. Impromptu meetings (81%) surpassed scheduled individual (45%) or department meetings (23%) as the favored mode of interaction.

Insert Table 2 about here

Another section details participants' responses to the content of the training sequence. A majority (78% and 88%, respectively) indicated course information was both new and useful to them. Respondents felt better prepared for consulting activities (71.4%) than for inservice delivery (66.2%). More than two-thirds (71.4%) indicated coursework sustained their interest in inservice presentation.

Several items of the questionnaires sent to principals, superintendents and district curriculum specialists were uninterpretable due to the high rate of no response (see Table 5). Three-fourths (78%) of those responding indicated awareness of the project's training content and the inservice delivery focus. A majority (54.8%), however, preferred informal to formal (23.8%) methods of peer inservice and consultation activities.

Insert Table 3 about here

Discussion

Of importance to teacher education personnel is the consideration of the efficacy of inservice and consultation training. Since less than half the participants (45%) completed the inservice project component, an explanation must be sought for this occurrance. Seven of twenty three participants cited

obstacles to implementation, most frequently the lack of district cooperation. As districts had voluntarily chosen for participation in this approved professional development activity, it was interesting a high number of participants perceived a lack of district support. Program support signified to the university was not always clearly extended to employees, but such can account for only part of the difficulty since six participants did not respond to this item Sixty-six percent indicated sufficient preparation in this area while only 45% undertook the project. Other possible causes may be ascertained from other data. Some participants cited socialization, geographic convenience and recertification as the rationale for participation. Such motives may not have provided sustained interest in the program once the structured sequence was complete. In contrast, those identified as successful clearly indicated as critical the factors of district support in planning and in delivery. Also noteworthy was the continuing support of these teachers through post-workshop feedback from the district.

The most revealing information was obtained from analysis of the data concerning under the evaluation of the consultation component. While some participants had previous consultation component in their job descriptions, a least a third both changed the role to include consultation skills or increased the time spent in consultation. Individual, informal, impromptu meetings were clearly the preferred method of conducting consultation activities for most teachers (81%). A possible

explanation of the mediocre response to inservice delivery is to be found in the participants' responses regarding consultation. Two-thirds preferred consultation over inservice. Twenty five percent used both methods, but almost precisely the same number who indicated a lack of followup toinservice delivery stated they used consultation specifically in lieu of the inservice. When faced with apathetic conditions within the district, teachers found consultation a more viable dissemination activity by which to share their skills and knowledge. This may be supported in part response participants felt better prepared by the university coursework for consultation than for inservice delivery.

Administrators'also responded to the peer directed activities for instructional improvement. Participants were seen as respected school leaders (75%) by their employers who were generally aware of the nature of their training (78%). There was strong preference for informal (54.8%) rather than formal (23.8%) modes of dissemination activity, which some explanation for the perceived lack of district support by half the SITE participants. Administrators' preference for informal transmission of skills and knowledge may have been conveyed as lack of enthusiasm for the formal modes of transmission and the substitution of consultation activities on the part of the participants.

A clear vote seems to be indicated for the inclusion of peer consultation activities as a more viable alternative to peer delivered inservice. Such consultation may be a more

realistic vehicle to the traditional conceptualization of peer use of the clinical supervision cycle, particularly when a quality control element of training and resources has been inserted. Collaborative consultation not only has empirical validation of the effectiveness of classroom teachers with mainstreamed handicapped children (Idol-Maestas, Lloyd, & Lilly, 1981; Nelson, 1981) but it appears from this study to have pragmatic validation as well.

Glatthorn (1984) cites several factors which seem to determine the feasibility of cooperative professional development. Of the five, (attitude of administrators, attitude of teacher associations, prevailing school climate, program monitoring, and available resources), three were directly addressed by this study. Although there was frequent monitoring of participant activities by the program coordinator and extensive resources were available, inservice activities were conducted by only half the participants. One key to successful implementation appeared to be administrator attitude; specifically the indication of a preference in mode of cooperative professional development. Where awareness and positive attitudes toward formal activities were evident to participants, they were successful in the formal modes of dissemination. Where administrators were approving of the general program but preferred informal modes, teachers seemed to adjust activities to accommodate district attitudes. It would appear that teachers can be successful in cooperative professional development if they have a variety of task skills

(both inservice and consultation) and if the administration can convey support and/or preferences for specific activities to participants.

Continued investigation into the conditions and attitudes which foster cooperative peer development should enable the status of peer inservice and consultation activities to rise from the ranks of least desirable to highly desirable quality inservice practices (Jamison, 1983). Project Site-Outreach provides an illustration of the cooperative professional development model, as well as an effective collaborative relationship between an institution of higher learning and public school districts in the search for effective school strategies and could serve as a model for other universities. Future research should focus on the interaction of the teacher designed inservice and consultation activities and factors of expert and referent power, readiness for organizational change and the role played by administrative sanctions and values. Such information would enable the refinement of the implementation of cooperative professional development in both inservice and consultation forms.

*This paper was supported in part by Grant G007901243 from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services.

References

Berman, P. J., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1979). Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. 8. Implement and sustaining innovations. Santa Monica, Ca.: Rand Corporation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 159 289).

Cogan, M., (1973). Clinical supervision. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Dornbush, S. M, & Scott, W. R. (1975). Evaluation and the exercise of lauthority. San Franciso: Jossey-Bass.

Edmonds, R. (1982). On school improvement. Educational Leadership, 40, (3), 13.

Glatthorn, Allan A. (1984). Differentiated supervision. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Glickman, C. (1985). Supervision of instruction.. Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Idol-Maestas, L., Lloyd, S., & Lilly, M. S. (1981). A noncategorical approach to direct service and teacher education. Exceptional Children, 48 (3), 213-220.

Idol-Maestas, L., Nevin, A., & Paolucci-Whitcomb, P. (1984). Facilitators' manual for collaborative consultation: Principles and techniques. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Jamison, P. (1983). Systematic development and evaluation of quality practices for inservice education. Teacher Education and Special Education, 6 (2),151-158.

Kerman, S. (1979, June). Teacher expectations and student achievement. Phi Delta Kappan, 6, 716-718.

Lawrence, G. (1974). Patterns of effective in-service education: A state of the art summary of reserarch on materials and procedures for changing teacher behaviors in in-service education. Tallahassee: Florida State Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 176 424.)

Lawrence, G., & Branch, J. (1979, June). Peer support as the heart of inservice education. Theory into Practice, 17, 245-247.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). School teacher: A sociological study Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 75-77.

McFaul, S. & Cooper, J. (1984, April). Clinical supervision: Theory vs. reality. Educational Leadership. 4-9.

Natriello, G. (1982). The impact of the evaluation of teaching on teacher effect and effectiveness. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Nelson, M., & Steven, K. B. (1981). An accountable consultation model for mainstreaming behaviorally disordered children. Behavior Disorders, 6, 82-91.

Pratzner, F. C. (1984). Quality of school life: Foundations for improvement. Educational Researcher, 13 (3), 20-25.

Reavis, C. A. (1977). A test of the clinical supervision model. Journal of Educational Research, 70, 311-315.

Sullivan, C. G. (1980). Clinical supervision: A state of the art review. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Table 1

Evaluation of Inservice Delivery by Participants

N= 42

	N	%
Conducted required inservice		
Yes	19	45.2
No	23	54.8
Reasons cited for noncompliance		
Lost interest	0	0
Not prepared	1	2.4
No district cooperation	11	26.2
No time	2	4.8
Deferred until later time	1	2.4
Other	2	4.8
More than one factor cited		77.1
Success factors		
District cooperation in planning		
yes	17	40.5
no	1	2.4
District cooperation in delivery		
yes	14	33.3
no	3	7.1
Extent of delivery		
Number of attendees		
0-10	1	2.4
11-20	2	4.8

21-30	2	4.8
31-35	1	2.4
36-45	1	2.4
46-50	4	9.5
51-60	2	4.8
61-75	1	2.4
76-80	1	2.4
81-99	4	9.5
Number of inservices delivered		
1	8	19.0
2	3	7.1
3	6	14.3
4	1	2.4
5	0	0
6	0	0
7	1	2.4
8	1	2.4
9	1	2.4
Evaluation activities		
Evaluation conducted		
yes	13	31
no	7	16.7
Sent to project coordinator		
yes	6	14.3
no	10	23.8

Feedback from district		
yes	15	35.7
no	2	4.8
Nature of feedback		
Extremely encouraging	6	14.3
Encouraging	10	23.8
Satisfactory	0	0
Discouraging	0	0

Table 2

Evaluation of Consultation Component

Questionnaire items	N	%
Role Change to include consulting		
Yes	15	35.7
No	24	57
no response	3	7.1
Percent work day spent in consulting		
0-2	10	23.8
2-5	1	2.4
5-6	7	16.7
8-10	8	19
11-15	1	2.4
16-20	4	9.5
21-25	3	7.1
26-30	2	4.8
31-40	1	2.4
41-50	1	2.4
51-75	1	2.4
76-99	1	2.4
Time represents increase		
Yes	14	33.3
No	23	54.8
No response	3	7.1
Prefer consulting to inservice		

Yes	27	64.3
No	9	21.4
No response	6	14.3
Consulting replaced inservice		
Yes	22	54.8
No	10	23.8
Added to inservice	10	23.8
Delivery of consultation		
Faculty room talk		
Yes	16	38.1
No	21	50.0
No response	5	11.9
Individual meetings		
Yes	34	81.0
No	3	7.1
No response	5	11.9
Formal versus informal		
Scheduled meetings		
Yes	19	45.2
No	18	42.9
No reponse	5	11.9
Impromptu		
Yes	34	81.0
No	3	7.1
No response	5	11.9
Department meetings		
Yes	10	23.8

No	27	64.3
No response	5	11.9
Other		
Yes	9	21.4
No	28	66.7
No response	5	11.9

Table 3

Administrators' evaluation of SITE participants

N=48

	N	%
Awareness		
Content competencies		
Yes	38	78.6
No	7	14.3
No response	3	7.1
Inservice competencies		
Yes	37	76.2
No	8	16.7
No response	3	7.1
Preferred Delivery mode		
Formal	12	23.8
Informal	27	54.8
No response	10	21.4
Perception of participants		
Educational leaders		
Yes	34	71.4
No	7	14.3
No response	7	14.3
Inservice Resource		
Yes	35	73.8
No	6	11.9
No response	7	14.3

Equal to outside personnel		
Yes	34	71.4
No	7	14.3
No response	7	14.3
Content Expertise		
Yes	38	78.6
No	5	9.5
No response	5	9.5
Delivery of services		
Teachers delivered inservices		
Yes	34	71.4
No	10	21.4
No response	4	8.3
Factors preventing inservice		
Topics not needed	0	0
Schedule difficulties	7	14.8
No peer interest	0	0
Unsure of quality	3	7.1
Prefer informal approach	5	9.5
Trainees expressed no interest	12	26.2